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## B/W NC

#### The AC’s Black/White framing erases the Jew from the question and reduces everything to phenotype.

Goldstein 09

(Eric L. Goldstein, Assistant professor of history and Jewish studies at Emory University, 2006.

“The Price of Whiteness”, pg 211) BS

Introduction ¶ Many Americans today, focused as they are on the basic division between whites and “peoples of color,” would undoubtedly accept the judgment of the eminent after African American writer James Baldwin, who claimed in 1967 that Jews’ history of difference and exclusion meant little in the United States. While the Jew had suffered abroad, wrote Baldwin at the height of the civil rights movement, here his “only relevance is that he is white.” Baldwin's statement underscored the dramatically different experiences America had offered to Jews and blacks. In a society where the color line played a major role in determining social status, Jews had been able to achieve a high level of success and integration by the 1960s, while African Americans were often still fighting for basic freedoms. In arguing that the color line had created a wholly welcoming, unproblematic environment for Jews in American society, however, Baldwin failed to capture the tumultuousness [confusion] that had often accompanied [of] Jews' efforts to find acceptance in a society organized around the categories of "black" and "white." Far from playing the role of undifferentiated whites, Jews held an uncertain relationship to whiteness from the late nineteenth century until the end of World War II, a period when both Jews and non-Jews spoke of the "Jewish race" and of "Hebrew blood." Although these racialized understandings of Jewishness have long been discredited among scientists and laypeople, they were very real to those who employed them during these years. As this study argues, Jews' transition from "racial" minority to part of the white mainstream was slow and freighted with difficulty, not only because native-born whites had a particularly difficult time seeing Jews as part of a unified, homogenous white population, but also because whiteness sat uneasily with many central aspects of Jewish identity. To white[s] Americans of the pre-World War II era, Jews were a racial conundrum, a group that could not be clearly pinned down according to the prevailing racial categories. Members of the dominant society had a long-standing investment in the notion of a clear racial dichotomy be­tween blacks and whites, a vision that gave them a sense of unity and superiority as they faced the challenges of the nation. Despite the diverse nature of the American population and the presence of many groups that were considered distinct in a racial sense-Native Americans, Asians, La­tinos and various European groups as well as African Americans-whites consistently tried to understand the racial landscape through the catego­ries of "black" and "white." Thus, even as American racial commentators frequently spoke of Mongolians and Mexicans, Celts and Teutons, Alpines and Mediterraneans, they often struggled to suppress this unnerving complexity by marking some of these groups as good candidates for as­similation into white America and confirming others as racial outsiders by comparing them to and lumping them with African Americans.2 ¶ Jews, however, presented a mix of qualities that was unusual among American "racial" groups and proved particularly resistant to categoriza­tion within the black-white system. In the minds of white Americans, Jews were clearly racial outsiders in many ways, demonstrating distinctive social patterns, clustering in urban neighborhoods, concentrating in certain trades and professions, and largely marrying within their own group. At the same time, however, most Jews did not conform to the assumptions many Americans made about the lowly status of despised racial minorities. Certainly, there were poor Jews who lived in squalid conditions, espe­cially after the massive wave of Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe began in the 1880s. But among European immigrant groups, Jews boasted an unusually high proportion of merchants and skilled workers, and they tended to rise rather quickly on the economic ladder.3 Unlike African Americans, who were seen by whites of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as the epitome of a backward, preindustrial race, Jews appeared to be thoroughly implicated in the urban, industrial, capitalist order that characterized the modern "civilized" world.¶ Because white Americans saw Jews as racially different and yet similar to themselves in many ways, the image they attached to them tended to be much more ambivalent than the one fastened on [blacks] African Americans and other more stable outsiders. Jews could be seen as contributors to progressive capitalism or as self-interested parasites; as disciplined and ambitious or as ruthlessly focused on profit. While the black-white dis­course of race bolstered white Americans' sense of confidence and superi­ority, their image of the Jew reflected the doubts and anxieties they har­bored about their own society, ultimately undermining the efficacy of their black-white worldview. During the initial decades of the century, white Americans often tried to suppress the troubling image of the Jew as they had suppressed the distinctiveness of other groups-either by comparing them to blacks or predicting their speedy assimilation into white society. Despite such efforts, however, the distinctiveness of the Jews and their failure to fit neatly within the categories of "black" and "white" continued to vex American commentators through the end of World War IL ¶ Another factor complicating the Jews' relationship to whiteness was their own intricate means of self-definition. While the knowledge that they were considered a problematic group in the American racial schema motivated Jews to try to conform to the prevailing racial paradigm and identify themselves unambiguously as white, their ongoing commitment to a distinctive identity often cut against their attempts to claim whiteness.¶

#### Placed is this ambiguity, Jews are fenced from both sides, having them suffer oppression for blacks and whites.

Marcus 10

Kenneth L. Marcus, CUNY Baruch College, Jewish Identity and Civil Rights in America, 2010

What is the status of Jewish bodies vis-à-vis the norms by which their materialization is imperfectly impelled? What, in other words, is the contemporary racial construction of American Jews [are]? Charles Mill[s], an influential race theorist, attempts rather awkwardly to recognize this phenomenon by characterized Jews as “off-white.” Regardless of the precise formulation, modern social theory supports the characterization of Jews as something racially other than purely white. The nature of this characterization is understandably imprecise in light of the still inchoate state of contemporary race theory and the relatively recent emergence of Jewish “whiteness.” Despite these difficulties, contemporary social scientific theory nevertheless provides another potential basis for Jewish antiracist claims: if American Jews are not wholly racially other, they are not wholly not-other either.¶ As we will see later on, the continuing evolution of Jewish racial identity provides not only opportunities but also dangers. To the extent that Jews have not fully negotiated their entrance into white society, Jews remain subject to adverse racial constructions. At the same time, for those to whom white society is itself a source of postcolonial or neocolonial umbrage, the perception of Jewish whiteness is itself a grounds for further disparagement. In other words, racists can have it both ways with Jews. Those who associate nonwhiteness with racial inferiority invariably classify Jews as nonwhite, whereas those who associate whiteness with inequitable privilege invariably classify Jews as white. In both cases, those who associate racial status with moral stature lump Jews in with whatever group is most disfavored. This categorization is based not on religious groups but on some form of ethnic or ancestral categorization. It depends for its legitimacy on the tacit belief that Jews are in some fashion recognizably different from others. The British Supreme Court addressed just this feature of what it calls “the Jewish ethnic group” when it observed that “[t]he man in the street would recognize a member of this group as a Jew, and discrimination on the ground of membership of the group as racial discrimination.

#### Voting negative is recognition of Jewish distinctiveness. The assertion of Jewish distinctiveness is key to moving beyond the framework of the black-white binary and creating room for Jewish survival. Goldstein 06

(Eric L. Goldstein, Assistant professor of history and Jewish studies at Emory University, 2006. “The Price of Whiteness”, pg 211) BS

In many ways, a song as riddled with tensions as Sandler's is a fitting anthem for contemporary ¶ American Jewry. Exhilarated, on the one hand, with the possibility of achieving success and ¶ acceptance of a kind unimaginable even twenty years ago, some are also afraid that the Jews ¶ may cease to exist as a distinct group. As a result, many Jews fret over the chances for "Jewish survival," aware of the costs of assimilation even as they pursue it.10 As Jews achieve further and further integration, breaking down social boundaries and marrying non-Jews in record numbers, the concern for preserving Jewish distinctiveness pervades all aspects of Jewish[ness] communal activity. Synagogues and Jewish federations scramble for ways to instill group identity in the younger generation and try to stem the tide of intermarriage. And despite their high level of economic and social integra­tion, Jews discuss, read about, and memorialize the Holocaust with zeal as a means of keeping their sense of difference from non-Jews alive.11 Far from having been eliminated by Jews' increasing integration into white America, the tensions and conflicting impulses of American Jewish iden­tity have only been accentuated. Like Sandler, many American Jews want to have it both ways. ¶ Much has changed since 1945, when Jews still worried that their Jew­ishness might keep them from being accepted as full members of white society. Today, many Jews fear that their thorough implication in that society may sever some of their strongest ties to Jewishness. Jews no longer have the language of "race" to express these deep attachments, but instead rely on the echoes of Jewish racial identity, a discourse of "tribalism," which gives voice to the feelings of loss Jews are experiencing in a world resistant to seeing them as a group apart. In addition, Jews have turned to the African American community in unprecedented ways in order to validate their own minority consciousness, a move that reflects their growing discomfort as white Americans. But like their renewed at­tempts at asserting Jewish "tribalism," their desire to see themselves as part of the multicultural rainbow of minority groups has met with resistance in a society fundamentally shaped by the categories of black and white. The origins of these contemporary trends are located in the "ethnic revival" of the 1960s and 1970s. Volumes could be written on the identity transformations of that period alone; what follows is meant only to summarize those events so that we may proceed to a fuller discussion of Jewish identity today.

### Turns Case

#### Thinking along the black-white binary crushes necessary coalitions and fails to adequately theorize the nature of racism, Alcoff 13

Linda Martín Alcoff, City University of New York who specializes in epistemology, feminism, race theory and existentialism, 2013. Afterward: The black/white binary and antiblack racism Critical Philosophy of Race, Volume 1, Issue 1, pp. 121-124, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/critical\_philosophy\_of\_race/v001/1.1.alcoff.pdf) BS

Living in these times of ongoing, persistent, and extreme antiblack racism,¶ from police violence to voter suppression to crushing unemployment and¶ poverty, it feels a harsh task to criticize the hegemony of the black/white binary in antiracist discourses. The difficult challenge of this critical project¶ has always been the question of how to critique the binary without deflating¶ our commitment to address antiblack racism or implicitly denying the value¶ and importance of work that is centered on this virulent form of racism. The¶ presidency of Barack Obama in the United States has only underscored the¶ fact that even in the twenty-first century the hysteria of what some have called¶ “negrophobia” continues to thrive and even to grow. And what is also persistently¶ obvious is that antiblack racism is a kind of equal-opportunity phenomenon,¶ infecting all communities of color in both overt and subtle ways.¶ Yet combating antiblack racism will require a coalition of forces motivated¶ to come together with a sense that the full range of race and identity¶ related problems are acknowledged and addressed. It thus requires¶ an understanding of all the ways racism itself works. The articles in this¶ special issue showcase the growth in our understandings of racism, from¶ antiblack racism, to the explosion of xenophobic nativism, to the incapacity¶ of the binary to capture Asian American women.¶ afterword¶ Clearly, we should begin to refer to racisms in the plural. The multiple¶ ways in which the targets of racism are constituted, (mis)represented, and¶ interpellated reveal differences of form, and not only, or even always, differences¶ of degree. Some groups are purported to be intellectual and cultural¶ inferiors, some are purported to be intellectually superior but unable¶ or unwilling to assimilate, others are viewed as constituting an inherent¶ existential threat to the West as a whole because of their religious culture.¶ These are just the main examples. Contrasting narratives yield different¶ affective responses, from contempt to animosity to fear to a complete disavowal¶ of existence, with coordinated practical responses that range from¶ forced assimilation into a stratified and segregated structure, to hysterical¶ overreactions of competitiveness, to military aggression. There may be¶ commonalities running through these variations such as a basic disrespect¶ for life, but these variations cannot explain the formations of specific racist¶ narratives or the diversity of practices.¶ Rather than highly general arguments about functionalism and universal¶ aversions to difference (arguments that breed pessimism, lack¶ convincing evidence, and eclipse important distinctions), we need local analyses. Anti-Latino racisms are themselves pluralist and diverse, with¶ quite different treatment meted out to Cubans of the professional class¶ versus Guatemalan day laborers or Puerto Ricans seeking social services.¶ Latinos in Germany often have quite a different experience than those¶ in Arizona. Racisms take their opportunities from local discourses and¶ conflicts and histories.¶ It is precisely this power of local conditions to construct effective local¶ racisms that gave the black/white binary its explanatory value. Slavery, the¶ Civil War, Reconstruction, the long history of lynching, Jim Crow segregation,¶ and the civil rights movement were central to the formation of the¶ complicated and always contested narrative of U.S. national identity. These¶ conditions provided a discursive and conceptual repertoire with which to¶ interpret other groups and other relationships, and also a set of practices—¶ institutional as well as interpersonal—that could be applied or revised and¶ sometimes given new life. The black/white binary continues to have prescriptive¶ purchase on the representation and treatment of other groups.¶ Yet what the critics of the binary hold is that it never exhausted or¶ entirely dominated the formation of racialized identities or racial practices¶ and relationships in the United States. It is simply impossible to reduce¶ all aspects of the racial history of the United States into this framework.¶ Attempting to do so obscures the diverse forms of treatment, as if genocide¶ and expulsion can be made analogous to enslavement. The latter is a form¶ of instrumentalization; the former two are attempts at erasure. Neglecting¶ such differences will undermine the possibility for coalition and will also¶ reduce our capacity to comprehend fully the forms of racism that occur¶ between and across communities of color.¶ Michael Omi and Howard Winant’s theory of “racial formations” and¶ “racial projects” remains a useful orientation that allows for the comprehension¶ of local and particular histories but also makes possible the linking¶ of projects within larger historical frames.1¶ The concept of racial formations¶ is the idea that there is a constant historical fluidity of the concepts and¶ practices of race, while the concept of racial projects concerns the ways in¶ which institutions govern the norms of conventional practice and social¶ interaction to produce functional effects. The white racial projects in evidence¶ today as the West transforms its demographic makeup are intensely¶ specific, with their incessant focus on Islam, for example, yet connected¶ to long histories of imagining the nation in racial and religious terms. My¶ exhortation for more localized analyses of racial phenomena is not meant¶ to convey the idea that any practices are irreducibly local: every idea, concept,¶ and practice of race resonates with memories, whether fictive or¶ material or both, and gains strength from both diachronic and synchronic¶ connections.¶ As Ronald Sundstrum’s work here shows, the nation remains a critical¶ venue for racial projects, not simply as an imaginary place in which¶ racial configurations are organized but also as a material site of political¶ institutions that manage resources and rights in accordance with complex¶ structures of differentiated positionality. The currents of anti-immigrant¶ xenophobia that unite Western countries today require analyses of the ways¶ in which racial concepts play a central role but they also showcase the inadequacy¶ of the black/white binary to explain all aspects of the current contestations¶ and alignments.¶ We who work in the philosophical wing of critical race theory need to¶ learn from our comrades in law and the social sciences to be more decentralized¶ in our theory, and thus more adept at comprehending the rapid¶ pace of change in configurations of meanings and practices. The inaugural¶ issue of this journal, with its excellent essays working on race from this¶ expanded lens, bodes well for the future theoretical work to be found here.¶

## Links

### SJW

#### The AC’s presents an intersectional privilege theory based on social justice activism that establishes neat oppressor/oppressed boundaries. This arrangement excludes Jewishness and its ambiguity, Fedullo 16

Fedullo, Bill. (Fedullo is a writer for The Phoneix, an independent newspaper at Swarthmore College. Fedullo is a writer for The Phoneix, an independent newspaper at Swarthmore College.)"The Privilege and Discontents of Jewishness." The Phoenix. WordPress, 11 Feb. 2016. Web. 17 Feb. 2016. <http://swarthmorephoenix.com/2016/02/11/the-privilege-and-discontents-of-jewishness/>. BS

This incident is one of many over the years that have made me less than proud to be a Swarthmore student. But what stuck with me was not indignation or anger – I don’t have it in me to stay angry at the idiot who stole the Menorah, who was probably animated more by asinine hooliganism than actual malice, and I was desensitized to anonymous Internet-based anti-Semitism a long time ago – but rather how much we lacked the language to properly articulate that indignation and anger.¶ ¶ Before I came to Swarthmore, I had what I took to be a proper handle on the part of my identity that is Jewish (or at least Ashkenazi; I speak here from a white Ashkenazi perspective, and don’t pretend to represent the experiences of other Jews). I did not speak Hebrew, I did not have a Jewish-sounding name, and I was not raised in the Judaic religion, but I knew this much: I was descended from a people with an enormously complex history. We had wandered; we had been hated and persecuted. In spite of it all, some of us had been raised above the status of the rest of our people, achieving in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries unprecedented prestige and influence in the courts of Europe. And then we had been butchered—machine gunned in a ravine outside Kiev, gassed in a camp in Poland, marched to our deaths in the closing days of World War II. This is not an abstraction for me; this was the fate of about half of my maternal ancestors, among whom my grandfather was one of the few survivors. We left Europe, and came to America, and in large part did very well for ourselves, quickly climbing the ranks of the professional and educated classes. We had an ambiguous relationship with Israel, a state whose many misdeeds we usually either ignored or justified. The living trauma of the Holocaust manifested itself in little, rarely questioned habits passed down from older generations: I had a friend in high school whose family kept their car packed with supplies, in case they needed to flee their home in a hurry. I recognized (and perhaps too quickly dismissed) the paranoia, which seemed to me at the time fairly hyperbolic: we were Americans, unto the third generation, and I trusted Americans. Anti-Semitism reared its head on occasion, certainly—I remember being told one summer at day camp that I should “burn in Hitler’s ovens,” and large portions of some of the Internet forums I frequented were lousy with Jew-haters—but anti-Semitism did not define my relationship with Jewishness. What defined it for me was rather a pride in intellectualism, a certain sense of humor, an awareness of mutual history, and a sense of Jewish community, a community with which I, as a half-Jew not raised in the faith, have always had an ambiguous relationship. In short, to me, Jews were complicated; our identity was neither wholly a boon nor wholly a curse. It was simply [is] a way of being, a history, one with its own benefits and its own discontents.¶ ¶ What we were, and are not, is underrepresented. At Swarthmore and many other elite colleges, students of Jewish descent tend to be numerically overrepresented. I do not know precisely how many Jewish students attend our college, but I have no doubt that we represent far more than 2-3% (our portion of the national population) of the student body. The language of underrepresentation totally fails to capture the Jewish experience at Swarthmore. It is part of a web of language that fails at the same task: the language of the contemporary social justice movement.¶ ¶ Contemporary social justice activists have a primary intellectual tool at their disposal: intersectional privilege theory. Intersectional privilege theory insists on a dichotomy between oppressor/advantaged and oppressed/marginalized identities. An individual may experience both oppression and advantage simultaneously—for example, a Muslim man may be oppressed insofar as he is a victim of Islamophobia, but may be advantaged insofar as he is a beneficiary of patriarchal relations—but [activists say] an identity exists firmly along the dichotomy. This is a dichotomy that fundamentally fails to account for identities that simultaneously confer both advantages and disadvantages.¶ ¶ This is not just a theoretical issue. Social justice activism has mostly failed to treat ambiguous identities, particularly the Jewish identity, with nuance. For the social justice activist, any difference in success between groups must be pathological, a sign that society has been rigged in that group’s favor. This is a valuable instinct; it can be used to expose concealed social and economic structures that privilege one group over another. The danger is when the instinct becomes law. The social justice activist, noting the disproportionate educational and professional success of Jews, may decide that there must be deep, underlying structures that are biasing society in their favor (then, of course, there are the blatant anti-Semites, who believe that this supposed societal bias is the product of an active conspiracy). For that sort of social justice activist, Jewish identity becomes a sort of hyper-whiteness. This meshes well with the tendency to frame Jewish presence in Israel as a purely settler-colonial project. On the other hand, a certain type of social justice activist may note the disadvantages faced by Jews—still extant [yet] anti-Semitic prejudice, stereotyping, tokenization of our religious practices, the threat of actual physical violence [continues] (more common in Europe than the United States, but not unknown here)—and decide that Jewishness is best understood as simply marginalized, in the same way that they understand African American, Muslim, or trans identities to be marginalized. Neither of [this] these [doesn’t] approaches yield an authentic account of Jewishness.
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Introduction ¶ Many Americans today, focused as they are on the basic division between whites and “peoples of color,” would undoubtedly accept the judgment of the eminent after African American writer James Baldwin, who claimed in 1967 that Jews’ history of difference and exclusion meant little in the United States. While the Jew had suffered abroad, wrote Baldwin at the height of the civil rights movement, here his “only relevance is that he is white.” Baldwin's statement underscored the dramatically different experiences America had offered to Jews and blacks. In a society where the color line played a major role in determining social status, Jews had been able to achieve a high level of success and integration by the 1960s, while African Americans were often still fighting for basic freedoms. In arguing that the color line had created a wholly welcoming, unproblematic environment for Jews in American society, however, Baldwin failed to capture the tumultuousness [confusion] that had often accompanied [of] Jews' efforts to find acceptance in a society organized around the categories of "black" and "white." Far from playing the role of undifferentiated whites, Jews held an uncertain relationship to whiteness from the late nineteenth century until the end of World War II, a period when both Jews and non-Jews spoke of the "Jewish race" and of "Hebrew blood." Although these racialized understandings of Jewishness have long been discredited among scientists and laypeople, they were very real to those who employed them during these years. As this study argues, Jews' transition from "racial" minority to part of the white mainstream was slow and freighted with difficulty, not only because native-born whites had a particularly difficult time seeing Jews as part of a unified, homogenous white population, but also because whiteness sat uneasily with many central aspects of Jewish identity. To white[s] Americans of the pre-World War II era, Jews were a racial conundrum, a group that could not be clearly pinned down according to the prevailing racial categories. Members of the dominant society had a long-standing investment in the notion of a clear racial dichotomy be­tween blacks and whites, a vision that gave them a sense of unity and superiority as they faced the challenges of the nation. Despite the diverse nature of the American population and the presence of many groups that were considered distinct in a racial sense-Native Americans, Asians, La­tinos and various European groups as well as African Americans-whites consistently tried to understand the racial landscape through the catego­ries of "black" and "white." Thus, even as American racial commentators frequently spoke of Mongolians and Mexicans, Celts and Teutons, Alpines and Mediterraneans, they often struggled to suppress this unnerving complexity by marking some of these groups as good candidates for as­similation into white America and confirming others as racial outsiders by comparing them to and lumping them with African Americans.2 ¶ Jews, however, presented a mix of qualities that was unusual among American "racial" groups and proved particularly resistant to categoriza­tion within the black-white system. In the minds of white Americans, Jews were clearly racial outsiders in many ways, demonstrating distinctive social patterns, clustering in urban neighborhoods, concentrating in certain trades and professions, and largely marrying within their own group. At the same time, however, most Jews did not conform to the assumptions many Americans made about the lowly status of despised racial minorities. Certainly, there were poor Jews who lived in squalid conditions, espe­cially after the massive wave of Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe began in the 1880s. But among European immigrant groups, Jews boasted an unusually high proportion of merchants and skilled workers, and they tended to rise rather quickly on the economic ladder.3 Unlike African Americans, who were seen by whites of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as the epitome of a backward, preindustrial race, Jews appeared to be thoroughly implicated in the urban, industrial, capitalist order that characterized the modern "civilized" world.¶ Because white Americans saw Jews as racially different and yet similar to themselves in many ways, the image they attached to them tended to be much more ambivalent than the one fastened on [blacks] African Americans and other more stable outsiders. Jews could be seen as contributors to progressive capitalism or as self-interested parasites; as disciplined and ambitious or as ruthlessly focused on profit. While the black-white dis­course of race bolstered white Americans' sense of confidence and superi­ority, their image of the Jew reflected the doubts and anxieties they har­bored about their own society, ultimately undermining the efficacy of their black-white worldview. During the initial decades of the century, white Americans often tried to suppress the troubling image of the Jew as they had suppressed the distinctiveness of other groups-either by comparing them to blacks or predicting their speedy assimilation into white society. Despite such efforts, however, the distinctiveness of the Jews and their failure to fit neatly within the categories of "black" and "white" continued to vex American commentators through the end of World War IL ¶ Another factor complicating the Jews' relationship to whiteness was their own intricate means of self-definition. While the knowledge that they were considered a problematic group in the American racial schema motivated Jews to try to conform to the prevailing racial paradigm and identify themselves unambiguously as white, their ongoing commitment to a distinctive identity often cut against their attempts to claim whiteness.¶

These tensions emerged in two distinct situations. First, Jews faced a dilemma in determining what their proper approach should be to the nation's primary racial outsiders, African Americans. In order to allay fears that they were an unstable racial element in white society, Jews often felt the need to assert a distinguishing line between themselves and the coun­try's black population. They hoped that by affirming the color line, they might help divert attention away from the problems raised by their own distinctiveness. Yet they often found their efforts complicated by a sense of identification with blacks and feelings of empathy for their plight. Though immigrants of many backgrounds had experienced persecution in their homelands, Jews were the group whose self-image was most thor­oughly bound up with outsider status. As a result, they frequently had strong misgivings about engaging in the kind of exclusivist behavior from which they had long suffered. The Jews' highly ambivalent approach to¶ ability African to either Americans reject or during the embrace the pre-World racial War II conventions period of reflected white their America. in-(¶ Second, an equally wrenching dilemma for Jews was the struggle they faced over their own racial self-definition. Having long been confined to the social margins of the Central and Eastern European societies in which they lived, Jews from those regions had come to see "apartness" as one of the most salient aspects of Jewish identity. As a result, in the American context they often defined themselves as a distinct "race," a description that captured their strong emotional connection to Jewish peoplehood. As Jews came under increasing scrutiny in American racial discourse, however, they were often torn between their commitment to Jewish racial identity and their desire to be seen as stable members of white society. Jews often tried to obscure, downplay, or tailor their racial self-under­standing to conform to the needs of the larger culture, but ultimately it continued to make its claim on them as they fashioned themselves as white Americans. Thus, in multiple ways, claiming the status of "whites" [is] in America was far from simple for Jews. It involved a complex emotional process in which conflicting desires for acceptance and distinctiveness often found no easy balance .¶

### Anti-Cap

#### Anti-capitalist movements have anti-semitic origins and portray the Jews as the “bankers” the “greedy pigs”. Sayani 11

Sayani, Daniel. (Yeshivat Hadar, Matmidim Fellow, Talmudic Studies) "Anti-Semitism in the Occupy Wall Street Movement." Anti-Semitism in the Occupy Wall Street Movement. N.p., 11 Oct. 2011. Web. 23 Mar. 2016. <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/item/9761-anti-semitism-in-the-occupy-wall-street-movement>. BS

For the past three weeks, protestors of various stripes have made their way to New York City’s Financial District as part of the movement known as “Occupy Wall Street,” a self-described “people-powered movement for democracy inspired by the Egyptian Tahrir Square uprisings.” Democratic Party bigwigs such as Al Sharpton, former Speaker of the House Rep. Nancy Pelosi, and countless other elected officials have lent their support to the cause, which has also merited the participation of numerous labor unions, and a host of socialist, communist, and other radical leftist political parties and groups, including the International ANSWER Coalition (which has demonstrably provided much support and strategic input to the Islamist and communist forces protesting in Cairo).¶ In addition, however, the Occupy Wall Street movement has also included a fair deal of anti-Semitic protesters, who rely on classically leftist and communist anti-semitic arguments associating Jews with capitalism, and who are informed by the anti-Israel, pro-Palestinian rhetoric espoused by those leftist coalitions fueling the Occupy Wall Street movement.¶ As the protests enter their fourth week, centered around Manhattan’s Zuccotti Park, several videos of participants spewing anti-Semitic rhetoric have surfaced, sparking new concerns about the groups and ideological positions represented at the protests. In addition, there are inexorable ties between the Occupy Wall Street movement and the “Arab Spring” protests threatening geopolitical stability in the Middle East. According to an undercover investigation conducted by National Review columnist Charles C.W. Cooke, protesters — including Danny Cline, who has emerged as a social media figurehead of sorts for the movement on YouTube and other forums — have routinely spewed anti-Israel and anti-Semitic messages. Cline has produced obscenity-laden diatribes against the perceived injustices of capitalism, and in one video, he is seen berating an elderly Jewish counter-protester, calling him a “bum,” mocking the man by asking him if he speaks English, and telling him to “go back to Israel.” Cooke says that Cline also shouted the “n-word” at the gentleman, and has been a fixture of the protests from their inception.¶ Another investigation discovered that on October 3, a protester described as homeless and out of work screamed to a sizable crowd that “the Jews control Wall Street,” and told counter-protesters to “go back to Israel,” and called them “greedy pigs,” saying that “this is not Israel.” The same protester also alleged that Jews control the media and blamed “Jewish bankers” for the nation’s economic woes.¶ Anti-Capitalism and Anti-Semitism¶ While a casual observer might believe that these incidents are mere isolated examples of hate-filled extremists attempting to co-opt an otherwise innocuous movement, an analysis of history and political thought demonstrates that anti-Semitism has always been a core element of anti-capitalist, socialist, and communist ideology. Anti-free market theoreticians have long spewed vitriol against the Jews. Historic examples are such figures such as Karl Marx, John Maynard Keynes, and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, whose ideas on political authority and economics constitute the basis of the radical agenda which the protesters seek to impose even further on the American people.¶ Such statist ideologues find themselves at odds with Judaism because unlike statism, Judaism, as a cohesive religious system, focuses on objective truth, earthly tyranny giving way to Divine omnipotence (as evident in the Exodus narrative), individual responsibility, the rule of law, the primacy of the individual and the individual’s dignity (the human person is seen as being created in the image and likeness of God, with religious and moral obligations incumbent upon each individual), charity that encourages ultimate self-sufficiency for its recipients (enshrined in Maimonides‘ Hilkhot Matanot Aniyim 10:1), and encourages hard work and the entrepreneurial spirit. The antinomian, atheistic, and anarchistic tendencies found within classical socialist and communist thought obviously run counter to Judaism’s moral framework and teachings against a progressive/graduated income tax, excessive taxation, public entitlements, state-forced altruism, and income equality. Indeed, historian Jerry Muller has pointed out, in his analysis Capitalism and the Jews, that free-market policies have greatly benefited the Jews, while Benjamin Ginsburg, in his study The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State, points out that it is authoritarian regimes of any variety (which are inherently anti-free market) which have proven disastrous for Jewish survival.¶ The protesters identified as espousing classically anti-Semitic tomes are merely perpetuating the socialist belief that Jews are to blame for “social injustice,” an idea that began with Proudhon. Proudhon is best known for being the first self-identified anarchist, and in 1840, he published What is Property? Or, An Inquiry Into the Principle of Right and Government, which inspired Karl Marx, who maintained a years-long correspondence with Proudhon. In it, he asserted that property is theft, and argued for mutualism, where each person is equally doled out some of society’s “means of production,” with trade representing equivalent amounts of labor, and where religious and ethnic identities are eradicated in favor of global revolutionary fervor and “brotherhood.” Proudhon scholar Stewart Edwards notes that Proudhon’s diaries (carnets) reveal his paranoid feelings of hatred against the Jewish people, and in 1847, considered publishing an article which called for the expulsion of the Jews from France, labeled them “the enemy of the human race,” and said that “this race must be sent back to Asia or exterminated.” Later that year, Proudhon’s disciple, Alphonse Toussenel, in his diatribe “Les Juifs, Rois de l’Epoque,” (“The Jews, Kings of the Era”), expanded upon Proudhon’s anti-Semitism, from a broader economic basis.¶ Karl Marx’s anti-Semitism is ubiquitous and is clearly laid out in his 1844 work Zur Judenfrage (“On the Jewish Question,” alternatively entitled “A World Without Jews.”) In it, Marx (whose parents were Jewish converts to Lutheranism) blames the Jews for income inequality (which communism sees as a grave evil), and sinisterly condemns Judaism as a societal opiate which is a mere reflection of “bourgeoisie” socioeconomic circumstances. Marx accuses Jews of being “capitalist hucksters,” viciously perpetuating a nearly 2000-year long canard of Jewish financial largesse, and articulates a position that was later used as anti-Semitic propaganda by the Nazi regime. Marx’s anti-Semitism falsely sees the modern commercialized world as a Jewish undertaking, and accuses Jews of worshiping the dollar, as the embodiment of capitalism and the representation of all of its purported evils. Scholar Bernard Lewis sees Zur Judenfrage as classically anti-Semitic propaganda, which would later be used by Hitler’s propagandist Joseph Goebbels as further anti-capitalistic vitriol against the Jews.¶ In addition, John Maynard Keynes, whose collectivist advocacy of bailouts, central banking, and massive governmental intervention to “stabilize” output over the business cycle has directed American economic policy in every presidential administration since FDR, was also known for strong biases against the Jews. Keynes, the left’s intellectual hero, infamously stated that “It is not agreeable to see civilization so under the ugly thumbs of its impure Jews who have all the money and the power and brains,” essentially equivalent to what many Occupy Wall Street protesters are spewing. Keynes also advocated segregation, in the same manner as Proudhon and the Nazis.¶ When understood that the collectivist left’s towering ideologues saw hatred of the Jews as essential to their ideology of global anti-capitalist revolution, it becomes clear that the anti-Semitism observed in the Occupy Wall Street movement has a blatant historical basis in the thought of Proudhon, Marx, and Keynes, the fathers of the anarchism, socialism, and economic collectivism driving these protests.

## Impacts

### Dual Oppression Impact

#### Placed is this ambiguity, Jews are fenced from both sides, having them suffer oppression for blacks and whites.
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Kenneth L. Marcus, CUNY Baruch College, Jewish Identity and Civil Rights in America, 2010

What is the status of Jewish bodies vis-à-vis the norms by which their materialization is imperfectly impelled? What, in other words, is the contemporary racial construction of American Jews [are]? Charles Mill[s], an influential race theorist, attempts rather awkwardly to recognize this phenomenon by characterized Jews as “off-white.” Regardless of the precise formulation, modern social theory supports the characterization of Jews as something racially other than purely white. The nature of this characterization is understandably imprecise in light of the still inchoate state of contemporary race theory and the relatively recent emergence of Jewish “whiteness.” Despite these difficulties, contemporary social scientific theory nevertheless provides another potential basis for Jewish antiracist claims: if American Jews are not wholly racially other, they are not wholly not-other either.¶ As we will see later on, the continuing evolution of Jewish racial identity provides not only opportunities but also dangers. To the extent that Jews have not fully negotiated their entrance into white society, Jews remain subject to adverse racial constructions. At the same time, for those to whom white society is itself a source of postcolonial or neocolonial umbrage, the perception of Jewish whiteness is itself a grounds for further disparagement. In other words, racists can have it both ways with Jews. Those who associate nonwhiteness with racial inferiority invariably classify Jews as nonwhite, whereas those who associate whiteness with inequitable privilege invariably classify Jews as white. In both cases, those who associate racial status with moral stature lump Jews in with whatever group is most disfavored. This categorization is based not on religious groups but on some form of ethnic or ancestral categorization. It depends for its legitimacy on the tacit belief that Jews are in some fashion recognizably different from others. The British Supreme Court addressed just this feature of what it calls “the Jewish ethnic group” when it observed that “[t]he man in the street would recognize a member of this group as a Jew, and discrimination on the ground of membership of the group as racial discrimination.

## Alts

### Alt

#### Voting negative is recognition of Jewish distinctiveness. The assertion of Jewish distinctiveness is key to moving beyond the framework of the black-white binary and creating room for Jewish survival. Goldstein 06

(Eric L. Goldstein, Assistant professor of history and Jewish studies at Emory University, 2006. “The Price of Whiteness”, pg 211) BS

In many ways, a song as riddled with tensions as Sandler's is a fitting anthem for contemporary ¶ American Jewry. Exhilarated, on the one hand, with the possibility of achieving success and ¶ acceptance of a kind unimaginable even twenty years ago, some are also afraid that the Jews ¶ may cease to exist as a distinct group. As a result, many Jews fret over the chances for "Jewish survival," aware of the costs of assimilation even as they pursue it.10 As Jews achieve further and further integration, breaking down social boundaries and marrying non-Jews in record numbers, the concern for preserving Jewish distinctiveness pervades all aspects of Jewish[ness] communal activity. Synagogues and Jewish federations scramble for ways to instill group identity in the younger generation and try to stem the tide of intermarriage. And despite their high level of economic and social integra­tion, Jews discuss, read about, and memorialize the Holocaust with zeal as a means of keeping their sense of difference from non-Jews alive.11 Far from having been eliminated by Jews' increasing integration into white America, the tensions and conflicting impulses of American Jewish iden­tity have only been accentuated. Like Sandler, many American Jews want to have it both ways. ¶ Much has changed since 1945, when Jews still worried that their Jew­ishness might keep them from being accepted as full members of white society. Today, many Jews fear that their thorough implication in that society may sever some of their strongest ties to Jewishness. Jews no longer have the language of "race" to express these deep attachments, but instead rely on the echoes of Jewish racial identity, a discourse of "tribalism," which gives voice to the feelings of loss Jews are experiencing in a world resistant to seeing them as a group apart. In addition, Jews have turned to the African American community in unprecedented ways in order to validate their own minority consciousness, a move that reflects their growing discomfort as white Americans. But like their renewed at­tempts at asserting Jewish "tribalism," their desire to see themselves as part of the multicultural rainbow of minority groups has met with resistance in a society fundamentally shaped by the categories of black and white. The origins of these contemporary trends are located in the "ethnic revival" of the 1960s and 1970s. Volumes could be written on the identity transformations of that period alone; what follows is meant only to summarize those events so that we may proceed to a fuller discussion of Jewish identity today.

## ROB

#### Anti-semitism is rising now; fighting within the academia is key. Veklerov 15

Veklerov, Eugene. "Articles: The Return of Academic Anti-Semitism." Articles: The Return of Academic Anti-Semitism. N.p., 10 May 2015. Web. 24 Mar. 2016. <http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2015/05/the\_return\_of\_academic\_antisemitism.html>. BS

The second justification links the rise of anti-Semitism on U.S. campuses to the Arab-Israeli conflict. This theory is more to the point. However, the link between anti-Israelism and anti-Semitism is not a simple cause-and-effect relation. Rather, the two mutually reinforce each other, forming a vicious circle. Furthermore, the students do not live in a vacuum. They pick up their cues from many sources, but particularly from their professors, who show their bias with impunity.¶ Here is an illustration of what the students pick up. In 2013, the American Studies Association (ASA) called for a boycott of Israeli academic institutions. Asked by a reporter why Israel was singled out, while other countries have much worse human rights records, the then ASA President Curtis Marez replied, “One has to start somewhere.” We are now well into 2015, but my search has not yielded any calls for boycotts of other countries issued by the ASA. It is becoming increasingly clear that the ASA’s moral indignation will end where it began. Marez, who is a professor of ethnic studies at the University of California at San Diego, further claimed that the United States has “[we have] a particular responsibility to answer the call for boycott because it is the largest supplier of military aid to the state of Israel.” However, [but] the U.S. provides military aid to many countries with really appalling human rights records, such as Pakistan and Egypt. Marez dismissed this argument by saying that civil society groups in those countries had not asked the ASA for a boycott.¶ That absurd exchange between Marez and the reporter reminded Harvard Professor Alan Dershowitz of the “bigoted response made by Harvard’s notorious anti-Semitic president A. Laurence Lowell, when he imposed anti-Jewish quotas a century ago. When asked why he singled out Jews for quotas, he replied, ‘Jews cheat.’ When the great Judge Learned Hand reminded him that Christians cheat too, Lowell responded, ‘You are changing the subject. We are talking about Jews now.’”¶ But does the inexplicable antipathy towards Israel, or towards Israel’s government, amount to anti-Semitism? Confronted with such charges, proponents of the boycott use a rhetorical device known as a straw man. They state that “disagreeing with the Israeli government or condemning its actions has nothing to do with anti-Semitism,” which is of course true. But that is a straw man argument, as the boycotters do not merely disagree with, or condemn, the Israeli government. Rather, they single [Israel] it out for condemnation; they apply different standards to Israel than to other[s] countries, which is a form of anti-Semitism. The fact that many boycotters eagerly sign papers condemning anti-Semitism does not change anything, as they claim that singling out the only Jewish state is not a form of anti-Semitism.¶ The same thought was recently expressed, albeit more diplomatically, by the U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry in his recent speech to the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC): “The HRC’s obsession with Israel actually risks undermining the credibility of the entire organization.” Another argument used by the boycotters is pointing to a few uber-progressive Jewish comrades among them, who are eager to vilify Israel. That argument is not new, as it was routinely used by Soviet propaganda in response to similar accusations against the U.S.S.R.¶ An inconvenient truth is that it is not just the Arab-Israeli conflict that fuels anti-Semitism. It works the other way around too: the old-fashioned anti-Semitism is the reason behind a biased narrative of the conflict in the Middle East. Simply put, Israel is the Jew among nations and is largely treated as such

# 2NR

### Anti-Semitism Increasing Now

Marcus 10
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The same forms of anti-Semitism also may be found on American college campuses, except that two additional forms also have been found in the American postsecondary context: black anti-Semitism, including incidents associated with the Nation of Islam and fundamentalist intolerance, exemplified by allegations at the U.S. Air Force Academy. By and large, however, the most significant recent episodes of campus anti-Semitism have been associated with anti-Zionism, arising partly in response to the second intifada is 2000 and the continuing Israeli-Palestinian crisis. In other words, the most conspicuous aspect of recent campus disturbances has involved incidents of the “new anti-Semitism.”¶ Bernard-Henri Lévy has theorized that the new anti-Semitism rests on three pillars that collectively constitute a new form of anti-Jewish discourse. They may be described loosely as anti-Semitism-denial, Holocaust-denial, and anti-Zionism [are]. These three pillars correspond respectively, to what Lévy calls the “triple pillars of the cult of victimhood, the taste for memory, and the punishment of evildoers…” The newness of this form of an old discourse is, Lévy argues, necessary in the post-Holocaust West for a widespread anti-Semitic movement “to emerge, for people to feel once again the desire and, above all, the *right* to burn all the synagogues they want, to attack boys wearing yarmulkes, to harass large numbers of rabbis, to kill not just one but many Ilan Halimis – in order for anti-Semitism to be reborn on a large scale.

### Link: Saying I’m Commodifying Ballots / Victimizing Myself

#### Claiming that its just victimhood is telling the Jews their hoarding victimhood capital like a parasite and is another link.
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The first pillar, anti-Semitism-denial, addresses the “love of victimhood,” instantiating the proposition that “[t]he Jews are no longer exploiting the wealth [and] of nations but monopolizing that much rarer good…human compassion.” This putative hoarding of victimhood capital is “the first reason to start resenting them again and, in clear conscience, in the name of the sacred concern due to all the world’s dead, to start hating them again.

### AT Race Card – Hypervigilance Good

Marcus 10

Kenneth L. Marcus, CUNY Baruch College, Jewish Identity and Civil Rights in America, 2010

The question is whether, in light of present circumstances, these arguments counsel in favor of less vigorous opposition to existing anti-Semitism, a position that has been described as “quietism.” The answer to this question might be “yes” if contemporary anti-Semitism were not widely and meticulously documented in the reports of such entities as the U.S. Department of State, the Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism, the U.K. All-Party Parliamentary Group against Antisemitism, and the European Jewish Congress. The sad record of American Jewish organizations during the Holocaust demonstrates both the historical pressures to refrain from “playing the anti-Semitism card” and the dangers inherent in the decision to do so. Even if the resurgence of global anti-Semitism were not so widely documented, however, it also should be considered – in the spirit of the so-called broken windows theory – that to permit even minor infractions is to risk the recurrence of larger ones. In this respect, excessive vigilance must be considered preferable to a failure of resolve.

### Silence on Campuses
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The irony in this charge is that hostile campus environments serve primarily to silence the victims of discrimination, and yet it is the discriminators and their allies who claim censorship. Specifically, anti-Semitic incidents have had the affect of silencing some Jewish students and faculty on college campuses who are intimidated from expressing their viewpoint publicly. In reference to this problem, Natan Sharansky has dubbed American Jewish college students the “new Jews of silence,” a phrase resonant of the experience of Russian Jews in the old Soviet Union. In other words, the *failure* to enforce antidiscrimination law may have a more chilling effect on campus free expression than the exercise of this power.

### AT Jews = Not a Race
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To assume that there exists a legitimate category of “racial” groups that excludes Jews is not sustainable. It is not correct, for example, to conclude as Rabbi Hayim Donim has, that “Jews obviously do not constitute a race (for race is a biological designation)…” The reasons for which Jews are said not to constitute a “race” apply equally to all other groups, which is one reason why race is no longer considered to be a primarily “biological designation.” The scientific community has rejected the validity of the concept of race as it recognized that there is more genetic variation with any population group (or “race”) than between two groups taken as a whole. In other words, the vast majority of genetic material shows no racial distinction.

### Jews = Historically Black
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Historically, Jews have been variously perceived as black, Asian, or white depending on the nature of the perceiver’s bias. Sander Gilman has shown that for centuries in Europe, Jews were considered to be nonwhite. Specifically, they were considered to be black because they were understood to have intermarried with Africans. In the 1780s, one writer expressed this perception: “There is no category of supposed human beings which comes closer to the Orangutan than does a Polish Jew… Covered from foot to head in filth, dirt and rags… the color of a Black.” Gilman concludes that “[b]eing black, being Jewish, being diseased, and being ‘ugly’ come to be inexorably linked.”

### Link: Jews = White
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This observation categorically fails to address what Kaye/Kantrowitz calls “the other Jews, the ones who don’t look white,” such as some “Miszrachi Jews from the Middle East, Latino/as from Latin America, Beta Israel from Ethiopia, Cochins from India, Chinese Jews from China…Jews by choice…[and b]iracial and multiracial Jews.” These groups arguably are “[i]nvisible, marginalized, not even imagined” in the narrative of obvious Jewish whiteness. N fact, however, these groups represent a much larger share of the American Jewish experience than is typically recognized. The Institute for Jewish & Community Research estimates that at least 20 percent of the American Jewish community consists of African, African-American, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, Sephardic, Mizhrahi, biracial, and multiracial Jews. The shortcomings of the mainstream narrative about Jewish “whiteness” are not limited to the ambiguous position that it leaves for these categories of Jews. In fact, that narrative cannot entirely cover even those Jews who seem most obviously white. Kaye/Kantrowitz illustrates this point well: “Even the Jew who looks white on New York City’s Upper West or Lower East Side may look quite the opposite in Maine or Colorado. Besides, what happens when you speak your (Jewish-sounding) name, or when your (less-white-looking) parent or child or lover meets you at work? What happens to your whiteness when you enter a Jewish space: a synagogue, Judaica bookstore, klezmer performance, or Jewish community center?
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Similarly, some commentators argue that the concept of Jewish “whiteness” is inherently a historical and parochial in the sense that a broader global and historical view would reveal a more complex picture. Michael Lerner has argued that “[t]he linguistic move of substituting ‘people of color’ for ‘oppressed minorities,’ coupled with the decision to refer to Jews as ‘Whites,’ becomes an anti-Semitic denial of Jewish history.” Similarly, Ralph Ellison once commented that “[m]any Negroes, like myself, make a positive distinction between “Whites” and “Jews.” Not to do so could be either offensive, embarrassing, unjust, or even dangerous.” For this reason, Lerner has argued that “Jews must respond with [a] determined insistence that we are not white, and that those who claim we are and exclude our history and literature from the newly emerging multicultural canon are our oppressors.”

### AT Not Oppressed

#### Saying Jews aren’t oppressed because of their success is like saying Asians aren’t oppressed. Veklerov 15

Veklerov, Eugene. "Articles: The Return of Academic Anti-Semitism." Articles: The Return of Academic Anti-Semitism. N.p., 10 May 2015. Web. 24 Mar. 2016. <http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2015/05/the\_return\_of\_academic\_antisemitism.html>. BS

The rise of anti-Semitism in U.S. colleges has alarmed conservative groups for quite some time, yet it was largely ignored by the liberal media until recently. The turning point was a spate of shocking, high-profile incidents involving student government bodies, normally bastions of political correctness and darlings of the radical left, which were covered by the New York Times, CNN and other news outlets. Forced to address this seemingly awkward issue, the media offers two rationalizations. The first argues [argument] that the Jewish students make up a largely successful group, and therefore, are not on the list of “protected species.” This argument is rather weak. Indeed, the Chinese students make up an even more successful group, but no public expression of anti-Chinese sentiments would be tolerated.

# Extra

O'Neill, Brendan. (As well as being the editor of spiked, Brendan is also a columnist for the Big Issue and Reason. He writes widely for a variety of other publications, including the Telegraph, the Spectator and the Australian.) "How Conspiracy Culture Made Anti-Semitism Respectable." Spiked. N.p., 3 Feb. 2014. Web. 24 Mar. 2016. <http%3A%2F%2Fwww.spiked-online.com%2Fnewsite%2Farticle%2Fhow-conspiracy-culture-made-anti-semitism-respectable%2F14598%23.VvMfJ-MrIb0>. BS

The conspiratorial cry can be heard everywhere these days. You can hear it in casually made left-wing claims about a ‘neoliberal cabal’ or a ‘neoliberal cult’ sinisterly controlling the economies of both Western nations and benighted Third World countries. You can hear it in the mainstream discussions about a ‘cult of bankers’ bringing about a recession and then benefiting from it in the shape of government handouts. You can hear it in the top-table talk about a ‘neocon conspiracy’ – that is, a tiny group of secretive American war-mongers – setting out to destroy Muslim countries and even control Europe. You can hear it in serious claims that ‘Big Oil’ demanded, won and effectively oversaw recent wars in Iraq and elsewhere. You can hear it in the oft-repeated claims that the Israel Lobby has the whole of Washington in its back pocket. You can hear it in the hysterical discussion of News International setting up a ‘shadow state’ in Britain, through which Rupert Murdoch ‘orchestrated public life from the shadows’. That idea of public life being controlled from the shadows – whether by neoliberal fundamentalists, money-loving oilmen or the Murdoch Empire – is now so mainstream, so widely accepted, that it is rare indeed to hear anyone point out how closely and scarily it echoes those conspiracy theories that were once the preserve of the nuttier sections of society.¶ Again and again, what are actually deeply complex issues and events, informed and swayed by the interplay of various constituencies and ideas – whether it’s modern capitalism, modern warfare or the modern media – are reduced by the conspiratorial imagination to brutally simplistic instances of malignant forces controlling the world, its inhabitants and our destinies. This mainstreaming of the conspiratorial imagination, which is further entrenched by popular TV and cinema, which seem positively obsessed with the idea of dark actors corrupting communities, towns or nations, speaks to a powerful sense of public detachment from political life. The more politics seems to be beyond the purview of us mere mortals, and the more there seems to be little clear correlation between our interests and political life as it currently exists, the more there is a temptation to believe that public life is controlled by others, often hidden, always self-interested, dangerous, toxic.¶ It is this mainstreaming of the conspiratorial imagination that explains the re-emergence, and the rising popularity, of the demonisation of Israel, Zionists and, sometimes, most tragically, the Jews. Throughout the twentieth century, conspiratorial thinking, which was then a pursuit of small, isolated groups, very often drew on the longstanding resources of anti-Semitism. For a fairly long time in Western societies, ‘The Jew’ had existed as a kind of sinister being, a corruptor of societies, depicted in some fringe literature as a money-hungry individual who could be held responsible for various nations’ economic and moral problems. Thus those who were given to conspiratorial thinking had a strong tendency to draw upon this rich resource of hateful literature in their search for The Thing that they could present as being in control of society. It is the same today: the rise and rise and mainstream embrace of conspiratorial thinking has led to a renewed plundering of the old resources of anti-Semitism in search of the cause of our current moral and economic malaise. Today, Israel or the Zionists, and sometimes explicitly the Jews, have become the vehicle through which the malevolent forces said to control all aspects of politics and life in general are given definition, a name, a face.¶ So mainstream has conspiratorial thinking become that even many of those currently attacking Dieudonné for his hateful comments have themselves propagated conspiracy theories about Zionists and even Jews controlling world affairs. So the Guardian has laid into both Dieudonné and Anelka for their ugly, populist anti-Zionism. Yet just last year that very paper published a cartoon showing a huge prime minister of Israel controlling tiny puppet versions of leading Western politicians – which is not a million miles from Dieudonné’s assertion that Zionists have ‘taken France hostage’. The New Statesman chastises Dieudonné’s ‘radicalism of fools’. Yet a few years ago it published a frontpage story headlined ‘A Kosher Conspiracy?’ which mused on the baleful influence of ‘Big Jewry’ on Western political life. Some Western leftists, including supporters of the Occupy movement, have criticised Dieudonné’s hate-mongering. Yet Occupy’s own founder, Kalle Lasn of Adbusters magazine, has previously authored articles exposing the Jews among America’s neocon set.¶ Indeed, Lasn’s article, titled ‘Why won’t anyone say they are Jewish?’, shows the extent to which the more intensely conspiratorial sections of society have a tendency to obsess over evil Zionists or even influential Jews. In his article, he listed ‘the 50 most influential neocons in the US’ and put a black mark next to the names of those who are Jewish. He discovered that ‘half of them are Jewish’, half of this sect that wants to ‘[reshape] the rest of the world into its morally superior image’ are Jews. Not surprisingly, this awful conspiratorial outlook trickled down into elements of the Occupy movement, where placards lambasted ‘Zionist Jews’ for running the US Federal Reserve. ‘Does anyone care about the anti-Semitism?’, asked the Washington Post after the American Nazi Party expressed its support for Occupy and its opposition to ‘Judeo-Capitalists’. Occupy’s conspiratorial conviction that a neoliberal cabal governs everything often crossed the line into handwringing over Zionist sects and even Jewish bankers. Among the leaking lobby, too, another of the modern world’s most explicitly conspiratorial outfits, there are occasional lapses into something very close to anti-Semitism: one of Wikileaks’ researchers, Israel Shamir, has been described by one British newspaper as ‘notorious for Holocaust denial and publishing a string of anti-Semitic articles’. It seems the more groups embrace the conspiratorial imagination, the more they move towards shallow anti-Zionism and even outright ‘Jew-exposure’.¶ What we are witnessing today is the emergence of an anti-Semitism that is not racial, but cultural, which is fuelled not by old racial stereotypes of the Jews but rather by cultural concerns about their growing influence. The engine of these sentiments is the conspiratorial imagination, the now very common conviction that small groups of peculiar forces control public life from the shadows, which has in turn given a new lease of life to concern about the impact of the Jews and their interests. It is, of course, entirely possible to be an anti-Zionist without being an anti-Semite. These are not the same thing. However, increasingly today, the obsession with Zionism is underpinned, not by a desire to put forward a specific, rational critique of that political ideology, but once again by the modern conspiratorial urge to discover a singular sinister source of global tensions and instability, by an overwhelming sense that the world is beyond our control and a desire to find the people allegedly responsible for this. As a consequence, modern anti-Zionism, especially the more populist variety, can feel more driven by hyperbole and even prejudice than by serious opposition to the Zionist outlook.